

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 12 2005

**FACSIMILE  
TRANSMISSION  
TO USPTO**

## CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION:

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING FACSIMILE  
TRANSMITTED TO THE USPTO ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW:

Date of Transmission: May 12, 2005

Name of Person Making Transmission: Teri McDonald

Signature:

*Teri McDonald* 5/12/05

## DOCUMENT(S) FAXED:

PAGES ATTACHED: 2

Re Applic of	Bruce B. Doris, et al.
Docket No.	FIS920040022US1
Serial No.	10/708,451
Filing Date	3/4/2004
Attorney	H. Daniel Schnurmann

Attached: Response to Restriction Requirement

PLEASE DELIVER TO: Yennhu B. Huynh  
EXAMINER: ART UNIT: 2813  
CONFIRMATION NO.: 2450  
PHONE NO:  
FAX NO: 703-872-9306

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE  
INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED,  
AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED,  
CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER  
APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE  
IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE  
OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE  
TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY  
NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION  
OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY  
PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS  
COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US  
IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL  
MESSAGE TO US AT THE ADDRESS TO THE RIGHT VIA  
THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE.

## INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION

Intellectual Property Law  
East Fishkill Facility  
2070 Route 52  
Hopewell Junction  
New York 12533-6531

Fax: 845-892-6363  
Phone: 845-894-2580




Applicants traverse the aforementioned Restriction Requirement for the following reason:

Applicants submit that the claims as filed are related as a process of fabricating a Field-Effect Transistor and are limited to making only FETs of the type illustrated in Figures 1-11. The Restriction Requirement justifies the restriction by vaguely stating that "the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products", but fails to list any such "other and materially different products". Thus, Applicants deem that both Groups I and II are one and the same, and they do not fit the criteria for restriction. Accordingly, it is believed that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

Notwithstanding the foregoing arguments, Applicants elect to prosecute the invention of GROUP I, consisting of Claims 1-3 and 11-20, drawn to the method, and withdraw from consideration the claims forming GROUP I, as being drawn to non-elected invention, without prejudice to the Applicants' right to file a Divisional or Continuation or Continuation-in-Part Patent Application for the withdrawn claims.

Respectfully submitted,  
BRUCE B. DORIS, ET AL.

By:   
H. Daniel Schnurmann, Agent  
Registration No. 35,791  
Tel. No. (845) 894 2481